UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| 10/766,104 | 01/27/2004 | Woonza M. Rhee | 2500-2287.05 | 2188 |
| 23980 7590 08/15/2007 MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY AND POPEO, P.C 1400 PAGE MILL ROAD PALO ALTO, CA 94304-1124 | | EXAMINER | | |
| | | FUBARA, BLESSING M | | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | • | | 1618 | |
| | | | , <u> </u> | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 08/15/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|--------------------|--------------|--|
| 10/766,104 | RHEE ET AL. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| Blessing M. Fubara | 1618 | |

| | Blessing M. Fubara | 1618 | | | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 30 July 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. | | | | | | | | |
| ∴ ∑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: | | | | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date | of the final rejection. | | | | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. | | | | | | | | |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). | | | | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | | | |
| NOTICE OF APPEAL | | | | | | | | |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). | | | | | | | | |
| AMENDMENTS | hut prior to the data of filing a brief | will not be entered to | | | | | | |
| The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co | • | | ecause | | | | | |
| (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo | | L below), | , | | | | | |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or | * | ducing or simplifying | the issues for | | | | | |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a | corresponding number of finally reje | ected claims. | | | | | | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13 | 21 See attached Nation of Non Co | maliant Amandment | (DTOL 224) | | | | | |
| · | | inpliant Amendment | (PTOL-324). | | | | | |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al | | timals filed emendme | nt concolina the | | | | | |
| non-allowable claim(s). | | | - | | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | I be entered and an e | explanation of | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | al and/or appellant fai | ils to provide a | | | | | |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation | n of the status of the claims after er | ntry is below or attach | red. | | | | | |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. | | | | | | | | |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). | | | | | | | | |
| 13. Other: | | | | | | | | |
| | | | • | | | | | |
| | | • | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant's arguments are not persuasive and do not overcome the rejection on record. The rejection reiterated in the final rejection is not new as applicant indicates, see Office action of 09/22/06. The rejection is specifically noted in line 5 of paragraph 2 of the Office action identifies the rejection as one of scope. In response to applicant's arguments filed 1/29/07, it was noted in the last office action of 4/11/07 that the specification does not provide enablement for every cross-linkable components having m-nucleophilic groups, with m>2 and every cross-linkable components having n-cross-linkable groups so that n>2 and m+n>5; and that the instant specification names succinimidyl glutarate, succinimidyl butyrate, succinimidyl acetate, succinimidyl succinamide and succinimidyl carbonate as components with electrophilic groups and aminated PEG's as the components with nucleophilic groups. Regarding pages 8-10 and nucleophilic groups, it is noted that polyamines such as polylysine and those listed on page 10 at paragraph [0083] and aminated PEGS are the only components disclosed within those pages as components having nucleophilic groups. The patentability of the pending claims is not based of the issued patent 6,534,591 as applicant would want it to be.



MICHAEL G. HARTLEY SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER